BEST AVAILABLE COPY

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 were said to be present in this application according to the office action. Claims 1-18 were rejected. Claims 1, 3, 4-7, 9, and 10-13 have been amended herein. Claims 16 and 18 have been canceled. Reconsideration of the rejections of all pending claims is requested.

I. Priority

The applicant has made an amendment in the specification claiming the benefit of an earlier filing date. Please note that this statement was also included in the transmittal requesting a continuing application filed on July 29, 2003. The statement is located on the bottom of page 1 under, Relate Back -35 USC 120. A copy of the transmittal is attached to this response and the above-referenced section is circled.

II. Rejection of Claims 7-12 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 7-12 are rejected under §35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Burnett et al. (U.S. 5,870,080).

CLAIM 7

Claim 7 is independent and is directed towards:

> A program storage medium readable by a computer, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the computer to perform method steps for transferring data from an IR equipped device to said computer via a computer pointing device with an integrated IR bridge, said method steps comprising:
> initiating communication between said IR equipped device and said computer by way of said computer pointing device using said integrated IR bridge;

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

determining what graphical object of a graphical user interface a cursor

is positioned over; and,

processing data sent via said integrated IR bridge according to what said

graphical object represents.

Burnett does not disclose "determining what graphical object of a graphical user interface a cursor is positioned over; and processing data sent via said integrated IR bridge according to what said graphical object represents." According to the Office Action, this element of claim 7 is disclosed at column 6, lines 25-29 of Burnett. The applicant disagrees with the office action because the cited portion of Burnett states that the pointing device simply transmits its position and command state. However, Burnett does not teach "determining what graphical object of a graphical user interface a cursor is positioned over; and processing data sent via said integrated IR bridge according to what said graphical object represents."

Nowhere in Burnett does it disclose that the computer pointing device determines what graphical object is located under the cursor as claimed in claim 7. The pointing device in Burnett only discloses determining the direction and velocity of a pointing device, not what graphical user interface the cursor is located over as claimed in claim 7.

Based on the foregoing, Burnett does not disclose all the elements of claim 7 and cannot anticipate claim 7. The Applicant respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection.

CLAIMS 8 and 10-12

Claims 8 and 10-12 are dependent on claim 7 and are deemed allowable by way of their dependence and for other reasons. Therefore, the applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections.

Case No. 10003188-4   7

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

CLAIM 9

Claim 9 is dependent on claim 1 and is allowable by way of its dependence and for other reasons. Claim 9 is directed toward:

The program storage medium of claim 7 wherein said graphical object comprises a screen area and said processing comprises transferring data between said IR equipped device and displaying a representation of said data in said screen area.

The office action cites column 6, lines 34-40 of Burnett as a basis for rejecting claim 9. The applicant notes that this section of Burnett relates to an electromagnetic transceiver and does not refer to displaying a representation of any data.

Based on the foregoing, the rejection of claim 9 has been overcome.

III. Rejection of Claims 1-6 and 13-18 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-6, 13-18 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burnett et al. (5,870,080).

CLAIM 1

Claim 1 is independent and is directed towards:

A computer operable method, comprising:

initiating communication between an IR equipped device and a computer pointing device with an IR bridge, wherein data is transferable between said computer pointing device and a computer;

determining what graphical object of a graphical user interface a cursor is positioned over; and,

processing data according to what said graphical object represents.

Case No. 10003188-4   8

Burnett does not teach "processing data according to what said graphical object represents" as claimed in claim 1. It is noted that the data is data received from the computer pointing device. The office action states that these elements of claim 1 are disclosed by Burnett at column 6, lines 34-39; 140 of Fig. 1; and column 4, lines 40-41. These sections of Burnett relate to data transmissions and not to processing any data as claimed in claim 1.

The applicant further notes that the office actions states that Burnett does not disclose a graphical user interface. Thus, it would have to be obvious to include the graphical user interface and to process data according to what a graphical object of the graphical user interface represents. The office action does not indicate how this would be obvious.

Based on the foregoing, Burnett does not disclose all the elements of claim 1 and cannot render claim 1 obvious. The Applicant respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection.

CLAIMS 2-6

Claims 2-6 are dependent on claim 1 and are deemed allowable by way of their dependence and for other reasons. Therefore, the applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections.

CLAIM 13

Claim 13 is independent and is directed towards:

An user interface for transferring data between a host computer and another device via an infrared link, comprising:

an infrared bridge integrated into a pointing device, said infrared bridge being communicatable with said host computer and said device;

a graphical user interface running on said host computer wherein said graphical user interface executes at least one function of a plurality of possible functions relating to data that is transferred between said device and said host computer via said infrared bridge.

Case No. 10003188-4   9

RFST AVAILABLE COPY

Claim 13 was rejected on the same grounds as claims 1. Therefore, the Applicant incorporate the rebuttals to the rejections of claims 1 into this rebuttal. For example, there is no disclosure related to executing at least one function relating to data that is transferred between a device and a host computer.

Based on the foregoing, Burnett does not disclose all the elements of claim 13 and cannot render claim 13 obvious. The Applicant respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection.

CLAIMS 14, 15 and 17

Claims 14, 15 and 17 are dependent on claim 13 and are deemed allowable by way of their dependence and for other reasons. Therefore, the applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections.

In view of the above, all of the pending claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KLAAS, LAW, O'MEARA & MALKIN, P.C.

Dated: November 18, 2005   By: _RW Nelson_____

Robert W. Nelson
Reg. No. 37,898
1999 Broadway, Suite 2225
Denver, CO 80202
Tel: (303) 298-9888
Fax: (303) 297-2266

Case No. 10003188-4   10